

Preface

The idea of retiring flashed in my mind in March 2010, when I encountered another blow in my career. Around that period of time, I began to feel more deeply that there is a supernatural power at work. This power will strike a balance on your life. Oh, yes, a human being is so insignificant in the hands of that power or the universe or multiverse. No wonder most of us sometimes feel hopeless and can easily lose direction. When wondering what will happen next, one may resort to fortune telling. To be sure, several decades ago, my father spent some money to ask a fortune-teller in Hong Kong to figure out my life. What the person augured may not be entirely correct. A sentence he wrote in Chinese did startle me: At the age of 57, I will have another *Da Ji* (in Mandarin Chinese)/blow. Indeed, someone in March 2010 said to me that I should go to another university. In November 2011, my application to be a *TeBie Pin Ren* (*Distinguished Visiting*) professor at Shanghai Jiao Tong University was luckily approved by the university authorities. The next round is the interview. I am really glad that some academics to put scholarship (*Xue Shu*) in the first place.

It is about time for me to highlight what I have done in the last few decades of my academic career. I feel that I have made a little contribution, or I have thought I have made contributions on eight major topics that interest me.

I began to write on the triangular relationship between Beijing, Washington, and Moscow. After that, I collected some 30 models and theories on such relationships. I also constructed at least two new models on triangular and triadic relationships. It is not easy, if one realizes how difficult it is to simplify or compress (or even rationalize) complex and complicated reality into a model or theory, dialectically and/or non-“dialectically.”

Later, for the sake of promotion from being the associate professor to full professor, my interest gradually shifted to the study of the South China Sea (SCS). I was emboldened when the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) in the Republic of China (ROC) on Taiwan in fall 1988 nominated me to testify at the Malaysian court on one case related to fishing boats which were caught by the Malaysian navy in August 1988. [As a result of this court case, the Overseas Fisheries Development Council of the ROC (OFDCROC) was created in November 1989. I also testified at two other court cases involving fishing boats from the ROC in the Federation of Malaysia

(FOM).] Based on my experience and the knowledge I acquired, the study covering, for example, legal matters was approved by various committees at the National Sun Yat-sen University and the Ministry of Education (MOE) in the ROC. One academic in the West cited my work which was published by *Chinese Yearbook of International Law and Affairs* (USA) in 1993, if I recall correctly, more than ten times in his book on the SCS. I felt a strong sense of achievement. In October 2011, I drafted the following paper. The chinese u-shaped line: Dialectically presented, applying my one-dot theory.

At the age of 35, I finally understood the major distinction between a model and theory. In September 2004, I became confident on qualitative research methods. In that month, I built my first model. It was from that time that I began to write faster. Before that, I struggled to organize my thoughts logically, systematically, and coherently. Often, I did not know how to dissolve contradictions. (To this day, many, if not most, administrators cannot dissolve the contradiction between “yes” and “no” when they are talking about the same issue.) Needless to say, it took me some 15 years to build the crab and frog motion model. In July 2011, I finally grasped the complete picture of the relationship between *BaGua* or *BaGuaTu* (a set of eight ancient China symbolic notations/gossip) (*BG*) and the four smaller diagrams as applied in this book. Earlier in October 2007, I dared to put forward the one-dot theory, which is, ironically as I later realized, but a version of *Yin* and *Yang* diagram or a tiny part of the grand diagram as shown in this study. In February 2010, at an international conference held in Chennai City, Republic of India (ROI), I, as an invited speaker, pointed out that the best seller, *Blue Ocean Strategy*, very much resembles the *Yin* and *Yang* diagram at the macro level. I am the first one in the world to point this out. I am proud to reiterate the following statement, after applying the one-dot theory which is accompanied by the crab and frog motion model and testing some 100 different, big and small case studies: A dialectical/crab and frog motion remark is just the opposite of a non-“dialectical”/crab and frog motion (usually deductive, linear, or cause and effect) remark, or, at best, they must meet halfway. In December 2010, I began to use the one-dot theory and the model to make a critique of the grounded theory, subscribers of which have chosen the applied way (as opposed to the classical way). In November 2009, at a research method workshop did I hear about this theory. To be sure, students of international relations would not or they are not able to apply this theory. In April 2010, I came to know about the applied way in conducting research and writing on business and management.

At the National Sun Yat-sen University, I also began to study the Chinese People’s Liberation Army (PLA), at the invitation of Professor Richard H. Yang. The project was financed by the Ministry of National Defense (MOND) of the ROC. I think I have made some contributions. It is worthwhile noting that my 1996 edited book *The Chinese PLA’s Perception of an Invasion of Taiwan* was cited twice in *Modernizing China’s Military* (2003) and in a well-known international weekly. And the first part of my January 2005 book should be very close to the words and deeds of the People’s Republic of China (PRC)’s armed forces. In other words, I think I have decoded the complex and complicated as well as dialectical relationship between the Communist Party of China (CPC) and the Chinese PLA.

In each topic, I tried to write something that nobody has done before. On September 1, 2011, I have tentatively defined the word dot as a simplified or compressed being or entity, in which its origin is traceable or can be the being. Thus, I have also studied topics related to *LiangAnZhongGuo/Bicoastal China*. I think I have decoded the Chinese Communist dialectical strategy toward the Taiwan area since late 1949. If you are interested in seeing the chart, please refer to my 2005 book, the summer 2008 article published in *Asian Affairs* (USA), or the Appendix I in this book. In this chart, one can clearly see why the national title for both sides of the Taiwan Strait since September 1997 or the CPC's 15th party congress should ironically be the ROC, which is created by Dr. SUN Yat-sen, not the PRC. Beijing leaders on purpose are dialectically silent on this issue. Alternatively, they would add quotation marks on the proper noun ROC to read "ROC." It wants Taipei to accept the proper noun, China, at the international level. In November 2010, my paper, *Conceptualizing Taiwan, Xinjiang, Tibet, etc. as One Dot: Contrasting and Testing Three One-dot Theories*, was presented at a Harvard University conference. It seems that one-dot theory has become more important than ever. Before the May Expo 2010 Shanghai China, Beijing in May 2009 publicized the following statement regarding the Taiwan Pavilion site, which is an extension of the "One China, Respective Interpretation": "The location of the Taiwan Pavilion is a dot in Zone A, which hosts the China Pavilion and national pavilions for Asian countries except Southeast Asian ones. The China Pavilion is also a dot in Zone A." Deciphered, China is a dot in itself. However, in the context of the zone, it is a partial dot. The same thing can be said of the Taiwan Pavilion. It is a dot but a partial dot in the context of China. In October 2011, I came across the following terms, namely, "dotting the dot in PIP" and "zone of coalescing dots".

At the suggestion of my mentor and friend, James C. Hsiung, at New York University (NYU), I embarked on the study of international regimes in March 1999. It took me almost 10 years to understand the very abstract term 99%. I dare not to say 100% because there could be something that I still ignored or neglected to understand. For the first time, I defined the term international regimes in the following words: A set (or sets) of at least 15 criteria/core elements/features (including those four as mentioned by Steven D. Krasner) in the contexts of (fragmented) issue-area, (fragmented) issue-areas, and issue-regimes. On this definition, one well-known scholar, Yale H. Ferguson, in August 2009 said: "Best wishes with this!" I am grateful to his encouragement. In February 2011, I emailed Hsiung, thanking him for urging me to study international regimes. It so happened that I also translated the term from English into Chinese: [國際(泛)領域暨議題 + 至少15個核心元素]. Translation is supposed to be short and *ChuanShen*/vivid. The problem with this one is that it is simply too long. This is certainly a minus. However, it is very close to what academics in the West have in mind when they mention the term.

When I was teaching at Swinburne University of Technology (Australia, Sarawak Campus) at the managerial level from June 2009 to June 2011, I coined a new term, international (corporate) governance, which was integrated from the following terms: international governance, international corporate governance, and corporate governance. In April 2011, the book was published. I also applied the international

regimes theory to study various topics, which were never written by others before: Marketing X as a University of Governance; Can We Apply the International (Corporate) Governance Theory to Study the Coca-Cola Company?; Redefining Global Business as International Regimes-related Trade and Commerce: Navigating Through an Ocean Without Confusion by Applying the One-dot Theory; Redefining Company as an International Regimes and/or Non-International Regimes-related Artificial Person: A One-dot Theory Interpretation; Making Sense of the Regimes Dimension of Investment: A One-dot Theory Interpretation; Having the Same Themed Business in the Same Street: Can the One-dot Theory be Applied?; and The Regimes and Non-Regimes Dimensions of Economic Cooperation Framework Agreement (ECFA). Many academics did not realize that when we study international/global governance or international (corporate) governance, we have to understand international regimes, which are the indispensable and best governance tool. Otherwise, we will not have a fuller or complete picture.

At this juncture, I must ask myself one tough question: Do I know enough about social science? The answer is obviously not. I still have to learn about quantitative method. This definitely will only happen in my next life, if there is reincarnation, because I can retire or slow down my research and writing. There is another issue that bothers me, if not others as well, that is, how many academics in the world put scholarship in the first place? To me, the criteria for scholarship in the order of importance are logic, contribution, consistency, preciseness, closeness to reality, etc. I thought our role as academics is to write critically and offer our advice, so as to improve upon our world. Yet, many academics have violated this basic and sacred principle. Sad to say, many decisions are made by a few (non-“experts”), and many academics bring petty politics to office or meeting, pulling each others’ legs. After being in the trade for almost 30 years, I am quite disappointed.

Last but not least, I would like to thank the New York-based Nova Business and Management Publications for reprinting Chapter 3, Management Diagrams, of my 2011 edited book, *International (Corporate) Governance*, in this book. In the last few years, Taipei-based book companies like Win Join Book Company, Ltd. and Ta Tong Book Company have partially supported my One-dot Theory Center, which was first created in April 2007. I am grateful to them.

National Quemoy University,
Jinmen County, Taiwan,
Republic of China

Peter Kien-hong YU/俞劍鴻, early 2012

One-dot Theory Described, Explained, Inferred, Justified,
and Applied

YU, P.K.-h.

2012, XII, 114 p. 15 illus., 9 illus. in color., Softcover

ISBN: 978-1-4614-2166-5